

REMARKS

Claims 8-16 are pending in the application.

Claim Objections

Claim 10 has been objected to because of some informalities.

Claim 10 has been amended to overcome this objection.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this objection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Portuesi (USP 5,987,509). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In the *Response to Arguments* section of the Office Action, the Examiner states:

The applicant argues that the external apparatus and communication unit are a remote controller and the IR communication port on the broadcast receiver. While the applicant's drawings do suggest this, the claim language does not clearly disclose this.

In view of this statement, claim 8 has been amended to emphasize that the external apparatus is a "remote controller," and the "communication unit" includes a "communication port for directly receiving a command from" the remote controller.

More specifically, the Examiner alleges, in essence, that element 52 shown in Fig. 5 of Portuesi corresponds to the "communication unit" and element 56 corresponds to the "external apparatus" of the present invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that in Portuesi, element 52 is an encoding system that encodes a movie file with embedded URLs into a video signal and encoded URLs and outputting them from a video output terminal to a distribution network, and element 56 is a decoding system that decodes the signals received from the encoding system 52 into URL data and video with embedded URLs, and displaying the video with embedded URLs on a display 70.

However, Portuesi fails to disclose or suggest that the decoding system 56 is a “remote controller,” and the encoding system 52 is a “communication unit, having a communication port for directly receiving a command from the remote controller,” as recited in claim 8.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

(a) Claim 9 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Portuesi in view of Blackketter et al. (USP 6,415,438). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 9, dependent on claim 8, is allowable at least for its dependency on claim 8.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

(b) Claim 10 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Portuesi in view of Vertelney (USP 6,760,884). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 10 is allowable at least for the similar reasons as stated in the foregoing with regard to claim 8.

More specifically, Portuesi fails to disclose or suggest that the encoding system 52 is a “first communication unit having a communication port for emitting and receiving signals

directly to and from the remote controller,” and the decoding system 56 is the “remote controller,” and as recited in claim 10.

The Examiner merely relies on the Vertelney to show an element that corresponds to the “second communication unit” of the present invention.

In view of this, even assuming that Portuesi and Vertelney can be combined, which Applicants do not admit, Portuesi in view of Vertelney fails to disclose or suggest the “remote controller” and the “first communication unit,” as recited in claim 10.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

(c) Claim 11 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Portuesi in view of Vertelney, and further in view of Lortz (USP 6,349,410). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 11, dependent on claim 10, is allowable at least for its dependency on claim 10.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

(d) Claim 12 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bendinelli (USP 6,061,719) in view of Portuesi. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant’s record indicates that the Bendinelli reference was neither listed on Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) nor cited in an information disclosure statement. The Examiner is respectfully requested to officially list this reference on PTO-892.

The Examiner states in the Office Action that Bendinelli discloses “a communication unit (figure 4, parts 54 and 36) receiving data and an image from an external apparatus (figure 4, part

52)” and “a display unit displaying the image received by said communication unit . . . (figure 4, parts 38 and 56).”

Bendinelli states:

A decoder 52 receives the television signal, extracts an embedded URL, and delivers it over a serial connection or other suitable connection to a computer 54 (see col. 5, lines 60-63);

The server 42 delivers a web page specified by the extracted URL to the computer 54, and the web page is displayed on a display 56 of the computer 54 (see col. 5, line 67 - col. 6, line 2); and

The decoder 52 supplies the picture portion of the television signal along with the extracted URL to the television 36. The television display 38 displays the picture portion of the television as well as the extracted URL (see col. 6, lines 2-6).

However, in Bendinelli, even assuming that the computer 54 and television 36 collectively correspond to the “communication unit” as alleged by the Examiner, they only receive URL and picture signals from the decoder 52 (corresponds to the “external apparatus” according to the Examiner), and do not receive the “still image” as recited in claim 12. Further, the display 56 of the computer 54 merely discloses the web page, and the television display 38 only displays the picture portion of the television and the URL.

The Examiner relies on the Portuesi to show a system with a memory that accumulates the separated button data and a button data retrieval unit.

In view of the foregoing, even assuming that Bendinelli and Portuesi can be combined, which Applicants do not admit, Bendinelli in view of Portuesi fails to disclose or suggest “a

communication unit receiving data and a still image from a broadcast receiver,” and “a display unit displaying the still image received by said communication unit,” as recited in claim 12.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

(e) Claims 13-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bendinelli in view of Portuesi in view of Vertelney. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 13 is allowable at least for the similar reasons as stated in the foregoing with regard to claim 12.

Claims 14 and 15, dependent on claim 13, are allowable at least for their dependency on claim 13.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

(f) Claim 16 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bendinelli, Portuesi, Vertelney, and further in view of Morrison (USP 6,591,292). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 16, dependent on claim 13, is allowable at least for its dependency on claim 13.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Conclusion

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of the pending claims in the present application are respectfully requested.


The Examiner is respectfully requested to enter this Reply After Final in that it raises no new issues. Alternatively, the Examiner is respectfully requested to enter this Reply After Final in that it places the application in better form for Appeal.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Maki Hatsumi (#40,417) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: April 5, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

for By  (reg # 40,417)
Charles Gorenstein
Registration No.: 29,271
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant

Attachment(s)